# UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

+ + + + +

## CONSUMER ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

+ + + + +

TRS WORKING GROUP

+ + + + +

BREAKOUT SESSION

+ + + + +

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2003

+ + + + +

The meeting convened at 10:00 a.m. in Room TW-C305 of the Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C., BRENDA KELLY-FREY, Chair, presiding.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

BRENDA KELLY-FREY, Chair
PATTY BANNIER
REBECCA LADEW
CLAY BOWEN
JOSEPH GORDON
PAM STEWART
CLAUDE STOUT
DIXIE ZIEGLER

#### P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(10:01 a.m.)

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: We are going to start the meeting of the TRS working group. As you know, the TRS working group has been meeting and has had two meetings, one in September, one in October, to prepare for today's recommendation from the TRS working group to the full CAC, in hopes that the CAC will approve our suggestions.

Mainly we concentrated on national outreach -- those were the issues -- and homeland security and how to pay possibly for national outreach and does the FCC have the authority to establish such a thing.

You will hear more about that report from the TRS working group this afternoon. However, I have been approached by several people to have them address the TRS working group with some unique and some other ideas that they have that they feel that the TRS working group needs to take into consideration; now, not for today's report to the FCC but for future working discussions among the TRS working group

people.

2.1

Mainly it is the VRS, video relay service.

Is there anyone in this group that is not familiar with video relay service before we go ahead?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Okay. So everyone seems to understand VRS. VRS is different. It is a completely different animal than TRS in that we have an operator who is an interpreter. That presents unique situations, working conditions, and so forth, for an interpreter who is on a VRS relay call, as opposed to someone who is on a standard TRS call.

I would like to ask Karen Peltz-Strauss because she approached me and asked that she speak with you all about the issues. We're here to listen to you.

MS. PELTZ-STRAUSS: Thanks, Brenda. I appreciate the opportunity to address the group.

I talked over the past few weeks with various people who are sitting here about the differences, as Brenda just mentioned, between VRS and TRS and the fact that there are lots of different

issues that are raised by VRS that simply were not present when TRS was first created.

VRS, as Brenda said, involves a live human being. For example, when there are harassing calls or calls or a rude nature, they're much more of an impact through VRS than through TRS.

In addition, when calls are made involving legal situations, such as calls that involve court cases or police or anything really having to do with something that is on the record, there are situations that require additional call setup, present ethical dilemmas for sign language interpreters. There are also differences between the two, of course, in funding, significant differences.

The list really does go on. There are lots of different issues that keep popping up. The FCC has had to address these issues in the past few years.

When TRS first started back in the late '80s, there were forms that were put together for the purpose of kind of hashing out all of the issues, everything from legal requirements to really mundane

2.1

things, such as how do you answer a phone call, what do you tell the person on the line, do you interpret or translate or type the call verbatim.

There is probably a laundry list of issues that need addressing for similar reasons with VRS. We think that it would be helpful for the FCC to have a form that it could invite providers, state agencies, consumers. Of course, the FCC would be an active participant and interpreters; most important, interpreters because the one group that is not really represented at the FCC at all on these issues is the interpreters. The more that we talk to interpreters, the more that we find that these issues on the front line are the ones that they know best and that they have the greatest stake in.

So what we are basically proposing -- and I think that this proposal comes from TDI as well -- is that right, Claude? -- is that the FCC hold a forum, hopefully this spring, where all of these various groups can come together.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 10:10 a.m. and went back on

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

the record at 10:11 a.m.)

MS. PELTZ-STRAUSS: I was done basically. So I came at a good time. I just was enjoying the fact that the meeting was proceeding in sign.

The bottom line is that we are hoping to be able to get these issues on the table in a public forum to give the FCC guidance on how to proceed.

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Okay. Thank you, Karen. That was a very good summary of what most of already are aware of and have been discussing for a period of time amongst ourselves anyway, but it's great to hear from other people so that it confirms our personal thinking.

So anybody else who would like to contribute to the discussion on having a VRS forum, some of the issues that you feel that need to be discussed, and some of the people, the key players that should be involved as well other than what Karen had mentioned?

MS. STEWART: Hi. I am Pam Stewart.

One of the things that I think would be very important, instead of just having a regular

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

forum, like we normally have, because I think this is a terrific idea, with people just presenting, presenting, presenting, and then a little bit of open discussion, I will suggest that we before it's set up have people send issues to whoever is coordinating it and then everybody put out there what is going to be discussed and have it more than a forum in the traditional sense, more of a discussion group, but have it strictly monitored or moderated and tell everybody that they will have a certain amount of time to respond so one person doesn't go on forever. So I'll stop going on forever.

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Is there anyone else? Claude?

MEMBER STOUT (via interpreter): Yes. I agree with Pam on what she is saying. She is right.

Oh, I'm sorry. This is Claude Stout speaking.

I agree with Pam because we don't want a person to be talking and then someone else going on and taking all day to do it and not meeting our goals. We really want a nice combination of a forum and a roundtable so that there is time for people to have an

2.1

1	opportunity to exchange perspectives, a combination of
2	consumer advocates and people in support of the
3	perspectives, as well as disagreeing perspectives. So
4	I'm just backing her point up.
5	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: How long do you
6	perceive this forum lasting? An all-day forum?
7	Half-day? Two days?
8	MEMBER STOUT: Definitely at least one
9	day, but I'm not sure if you have a second and third
10	day, it would be productive. I think if you have one
11	day with a very structured program to be able to meet
12	all of our goals, one day hopefully should be able to
13	do it because everyone is so busy. There are so many
14	things on their plate. If you have a program and an
15	agenda to follow, then one day should be good enough.
16	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: I would like to
17	ask Pam Stewart to please sit in front of me because
18	I have a feeling I am going to miss her most of the
19	time.
20	MS. STEWART: This is Pam. I will go with
21	Claude.
22	Everybody is really busy. I think we also

ought to make sure we have it so that people can join by conference call for those people who cannot get to the FCC but have significant information to input to this process.

And I would agree with Claude that one day would be great, but, again, because we all know when we do anything by too large a committee, not a lot gets done, I would suggest that the FCC appoint or ask for or whatever a working committee for this that then takes all of those issues, sort of puts them together in a cohesive manner, and then maybe do a follow-up with what we feel we got from it, and where people want to go from there, sort of present to everyone on the Web site and on e-mail or whatever what we feel the outcome of this form was and then set up a follow-up meeting to take ideas from them.

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Would you also envision the possibility of having something like displays from the different vendors as well? I think one of the TRS forums, we had like separate rooms where we had the different TRS, a fair kind of a thing. Would you envision something like that for the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

TRS forum or not?

2.1

MS. PELTZ-STRAUSS: I actually don't envision it to be that. I envision it to be more of what Pam was saying: -- and I am glad that Mark is nodding -- an interactive. Really, the goal is to have an interactive discussion.

The one point, actually, that I left off that is the most important point of all that needs to be talked about is where we are going with VRS. It's kind of the obvious one, but I left it out. That is probably the most critical question at this point.

Now that the service is several years old, it still seems to be in a state of limbo and isn't ready to move on towards more functional equivalency.

Once you start having kind of shows and demonstrations, it's not what at least I was hoping. I think that I am seeing other nods. I am really hoping that what comes out of this is a consensus about where VRS, the future of VRS, is.

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Okay. I agree.

I just was throwing it out because I want to make sure that it wasn't something that someone was thinking of

1	and wanted to have included and later when we got
2	close to possibly setting up the forum, that people
3	would complain and say, "But I wanted to demonstrate
4	and I wanted to show our products."
5	Okay. Anyone else?
6	MS. STEWART: Just one last thing. This
7	is Pam.
8	One of the things that we tend to do is
9	compartmentalize this often. I think this is the
10	perfect opportunity to get state administrators, the
11	FCC, the vendors, everybody sort of on the same page,
12	everybody understanding and bringing up their
13	concerns.
14	So then the FCC has this other idea of
15	where everybody is and what everybody's issues are.
16	And then they can make future rulings without
17	additional information in mind.
18	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Thank you.
19	Claude?
20	MEMBER STOUT: Yes. I wanted to clarify.
21	I think the VRS forum should have a program that
22	allows consumers to spell out their expectations with

VRS services, then the government as well as the industry, where we make every attempt to respond to those expectations. I want to make sure that we have that understanding about that.

MS. PELTZ-STRAUSS: I just have a procedural question about what happens now with respect to this subcommittee and where does this recommendation go at this point. Do you vote on it? Do you then make a recommendation to the full committee?

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Yes. The TRS working group will. It's not going to be expanded after today's recommendation to the FCC, I don't believe. I know the FCC has asked us to answer specific questions.

However, I think TRS is going to continue to be a hot spot for quite a few years. I can envision this. And we will probably assume responsibilities for TRS in the provision of those services as they relate to the deaf and hard of hearing and other individuals and hearing people who use relay in the various ways and methods of using

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

relay.

2.1

So I can see us just constantly being there on the agenda to make recommendations to the FCC. I don't think they're going to turn us down. Right, Scott?

MR. MARSHALL: Absolutely.

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: The CAC will be meeting again in March. And between now and March, we can also be discussing this and the other issues that we need to address as well, the homeland security issue that we will have to be discussing or start discussing today with you all as well. So we will be making more recommendations to the FCC.

Claude?

MEMBER STOUT: Another question. Did we get the idea here this morning to have a bureau's forum in place for next spring? Is that right? I think it wouldn't hurt to make it part of our report this afternoon, to make that addition that we're recommending FCC consider sponsoring a forum for VRS.

I think that we need to pass on the recommendation to the FCC to act on it. And we have

1	people here, FCC staff, who have already listened to
2	this right now this morning. And if you feel that we
3	need to discuss this some more before we actually make
4	the recommendation, I think we already agree on this.
5	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: You're right,
6	Claude, because we have everyone here from the working
7	group. And if we all agree to make that
8	recommendation, we can certainly add that to our
9	recommendations from this afternoon and just notify
10	them that TRS is changing, evolving, and we would like
11	to recommend that the FCC consider having some kind of
12	a forum to address the issues of VRS in the spring.
13	That's fine. That's fine. That's
14	wonderful. We can do that. Thank you.
15	MEMBER STOUT: You're welcome.
16	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Scott?
17	MR. MARSHALL: Yes?
18	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: You look like
19	you're ready to say something.
20	MR. MARSHALL: I don't think we have a
21	problem. Usually we need to notice recommendations in
22	the Federal Register before the full committee can

deliberate on them, but I think that VRS and TRS are so intertwined or related that probably we don't have a Federal Register issue. So you could add this recommendation to your report this afternoon if you wanted to.

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Let me ask a question of you, Scott. When we, the working group, make our recommendations this afternoon and assuming that the full CAC approves our recommendation intact, what happens after that?

MR. MARSHALL: Traditionally what we have done is entered CAC recommendations in relevant proceedings that are presently open before the commission. We do that as an exparte communication from the committee.

It also gets sent not only to the Secretary's office for the official record, but we also transmit the recommendations to the appropriate FCC staff that are concerned, most concerned, about the issue.

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Okay. And if someone from the CAC has additional items that they

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

would like to see added to our recommendations and the 1 2 full CAC approves it with the amendments from the 3 person or the group that made the amendments, will that be included and proposed and recommended to the 4 5 FCC? 6 MR. MARSHALL: Yes, but --7 CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: So what I am saying is this VRS issue can be considered as an 8 amendment to the TRS this afternoon. 9 10 MR. MARSHALL: Yes, yes, if you want to do 11 it that way. Now, if you came to me with an entirely 12 different issue, then we would have to notice it in 13 the Federal Register before the full committee could 14 operate on it. 15 CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Right. 16 MR. MARSHALL: I think if you want to 17 amend your recommendation this afternoon to include a 18 VRS recommendation, I think you would be okay. CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Okay. So I would 19 20 suggest that the TRS working group make the amendment 2.1 to our own recommendation because it's something that

we did not consider. We were narrowly focusing on the

issues that were handed to us from the FCC. And now we have broadened it a little bit.

MEMBER STOUT: I would like to add this afternoon that the circumstances have come up recently that warrant us to have this at an earlier time. We can't wait until this next CAC meeting to consider that.

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Right.

MEMBER STOUT: So it's important that we go ahead and recommend this to the FCC and that they go ahead with the forum as soon as possible. To wait six more months on that issue would not be a time that we can afford to waste.

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Great. Okay.

The other issue that we have been asked to discuss in the TRS working group is the homeland security issues.

We are fortunate to have with us this morning Kris

Monteith from the FCC, who I am going to ask to kind of come and give us a little bit of a summary of why we were asked and what we are charged with.

I also have a document that the FCC has just begun, I mean just touched, the tip of the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

iceberg on regarding homeland security. I want to thank them for just doing this for us as a starting point. It's by all means not complete. It's just something to start with for us to begin thinking and throwing in and adding. It's definitely not a complete document yet.

Kris?

2.1

MS. MONTEITH: Good morning. Thank you very much for having me here today.

I just wanted to give you sort of an overview of what this issue is and what we're looking for in terms of hopefully a working document and result that will be helpful to the commission.

As you know, the commission has a homeland security policy council that was established following the 9/11 events in 2001. And that policy council looks at all homeland security and emergency response system types of issues within the agency from all of the bureaus and offices and specifically looks at what some of the communications issues are, what the infrastructure protection issues are, what we can do through our rulemaking proceedings, our programs and

policies and plans to help ensure that telecommunications infrastructure and other critical telecommunications infrastructure is reliable, responds the way we want it to in an emergency, that we have priority restoration systems in place, all of those kinds of issues.

In, I believe it was, July, either June or July of this past year, the homeland security policy council at the direction of the chairman put together an action plan to assist the council and the agency in moving forward on some of the issues that have been identified.

In response to Claude coming in to talk to us and Brenda coming in and others coming in to speak with us, we identified an issue of what some of the issues might be that folks in the disability community encounter in an emergency situation that may be a concern or a problem or otherwise is something that the commission needs to look at and try to resolve.

So let me just read from the homeland security action plan what the specific charge is. The action plan had two broad objectives, and it was this

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

second objective that concerns this committee and the disability community overall.

The objective is to promote access to effective communications services by public safety, public health, and other emergency personnel. Under that broad objective, there are several subissues or action items listed. Let me read the one involving the disability community, "convene a summit of stakeholders, including representatives from disabilities rights organizations, telecommunications relay centers, the commission's consumer advisory committee, and local and state government advisory committee, and other governmental entities to identify specific communications issues that confront individuals with disabilities, particularly the hard of hearing and deaf individuals, during national emergencies or terrorist attacks and develop a strategy for resolving these issues where possible." So that is the mandate.

What the consumer and governmental affairs bureau has done through its intergovernmental affairs group and the disability rights office is to put

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

together at least a start of a list of what some of the issues may be. We did that to help spur the discussion. It's always easier if you have a document before you, I think, that you can start reviewing to brainstorm what some of the issues are.

Ultimately what we would like to see in the near term is a list of what the issues are and some description of that issue and then an identification of what some possible solutions might be.

For example, if it's something, if there's a problem that could be fixed by a change in the commission's rules, that would be a solution. If it's an issue that could be fixed by greater outreach or education, identify that as a possible solution.

Then following that kind of development of a working document, then we need to bring these groups together that have been identified and the action item and really walk through the issue, the possible solution, and get to what we hope will be an ultimate recommendation to the homeland security policy council on how we can move forward to try and resolve these

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

issues.

2.1

I'll be happy to answer questions.

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Does anyone have any questions for Kris? Claude?

MEMBER STOUT: Is there going to be a subcommittee on that or what is going to be happening, the time line? The FCC somewhere in a document mentioned that you were thinking of having a summit on homeland security issues for people with disabilities. And I'm sure that's part of the document that you're talking about about a summit.

I'm wondering, what does FCC have in mind getting the summit going? We need this as soon as possible.

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: I'm just kind of laughing to myself because in our working group recommendations, we did recommend a summit of different disability groups, maybe separating a summit for those individuals who have hearing loss, deaf, hard of hearing, late deafened, and so forth, because our issues are communication issues. And they are so different than the other disability groups, where they

have no problem communicating but they have problems 1 2 with accessing things. 3 So we did recommend and, in fact, we are recommending that that summit take place potentially 4 5 before the March CAC meeting so that some of the 6 people who will be attending this CAC meeting will 7 have to come one or two days earlier to attend the summit as it relates to homeland security issues and 8 9 then stay and continue for the CAC meeting because some of those people will be the subject matter 10 11 experts. 12 MR. MARSHALL: Brenda? 13 CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Scott? 14 MR. MARSHALL: Could I comment further on the time line? 15 CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Yes? 16 17 MR. MARSHALL: Kris and I were just 18 chatting. You're right. The thought is to have the summit take place immediately before the next CAC 19 20 meeting, which is March 26th. And at the moment, we 2.1 have a reservation for this room for all day on March

25th for the broader summit to go through these

recommendations.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

The process would be that the summit would then make recommendations for the CAC and CAC would then recommend to the commission the following day, on the 26th.

We also have scheduled tentatively per your request a pre-summit meeting, if you will, of disability-related organizations. And I believe that date we have reserved this room for a four-hour meeting on January 9th, again with the idea that this document that we have before you today would be circulated in advance of that meeting and the disability groups could then decide where they wanted to go with all of this stuff before sending representatives to the broader summit.

Is that right, Kris?

MS. MONTEITH: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Thanks for the clarification. Okay. Sounds great to me.

Pam?

MS. STEWART: I would just like to make a suggestion, Brenda. You were referring a couple of

times to the suggestions that the committee made, and it might be a good idea because apparently not everybody here has -- oh, you can't do it yet? Okay. I thought this was the group that was presenting it. Okay.

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: We've been asked to. The FCC, as I said before, has just begun a document talking about the communication issues for people with disabilities as it applies to homeland security.

I have about 20 copies here I would like to hand out. I would like to work on this as a group because we have a lot of expertise here in this room, and I would like to capitalize on your feedback so we can add to and expand this document for the FCC.

Okay?

So here we go. This covers roughly six different topics as the FCC sees it. I would like for ease of communication that we work on one topic at a time so that we have time to read it and then talk about it, add some ideas to this, and then work on the next one, take a few minutes, read it, discuss it,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

rather than everyone trying to read through the complete document. How does that sound? Is that okay? Okay. We'll talk about the communication mode:

I'm going to ask that we please turn off the microphones at this time because we have Dixie Ziegler from Hamilton who has been apparently listening to our TRS working group discussion but has not been able to participate you have a choice of either having the phones on for her to comment or the microphones on. So I am going to ask that the microphones be turned off so we can hear from Dixie.

Dixie?

MEMBER ZIEGLER: Yes. I just had a couple of quick questions. And I apologize that I kind of jumped here in the middle. The meeting on January 9th, I wasn't clear what was the purpose and who was to be involved in that. So if we could go back to that, that would be great.

I did have a question when Karen was talking about the VRS forum, but hopefully I will be able to catch that up with Patty. I hate to go back

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

and discuss that at this point in time. If there is 1 2 time at the end, I can ask that question. 3 But if Kris could explain a little bit or Scott a little bit more on what was the purpose of the 4 5 January 9th meeting, that would be helpful. 6 Thank you. 7 CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Both Scott and Kris are out of the room at this time. This is Brenda 8 9 speaking. Hi, Dixie. MEMBER ZIEGLER: Hi, Brenda. 10 11 CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: I hope you are 12 doing well. I'm sorry you're not here with us. 13 MEMBER ZIEGLER: Me, too. Thank you. 14 CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: If you recall our 15 TRS working group, we suggested that we have a summit of various representatives, users, and so forth, of 16 17 TRS and just disability, hearing disabilities, meet to 18 discuss the various issues as they relate to TRS communication issues, emergency care, medical care, 19 20 911, television, alerting systems, and so forth, 2.1 because the deaf and hard of hearing issues are so

different and unique as compared to the other

1 disability groups. 2 This pre-summit meeting on January 9th is to discuss those issues related to the deaf and hard 3 of hearing. And from that group, we will make 4 5 recommendations and point out problems and point out solutions hopefully to problems and will then bring it 6 7 to the March 25th broad summit meeting. MEMBER ZIEGLER: But you are wanting TRS 8 9 providers and any stakeholders to be there on the 9th? 10 CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Absolutely. 11 MEMBER ZIEGLER: Okay. Thank you. 12 CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Absolutely. 13 then the 26th any recommendations that are made by the 14 group on March 25th as a result of the January 9th 15 meeting will be then presented to the full CAC on March 26th. 16 17 MEMBER ZIEGLER: Very good. Thank you for 18 clarifying that.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

the summit, the pre-summit, on the 9th and the full

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Okay.

Dixie, I just want to clarify that my understanding of

MS. BROWN: This is Amy Brown from CGB.

19

20

2.1

1	summit on the 25th would be to include all
2	disabilities, not just hard of hearing, but it would
3	be mobility and sight as well.
4	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Okay. That's for
5	January 9th would be any disabilities?
6	MS. BROWN: And the 25th also.
7	MR. MARSHALL: But they would be separate
8	on the 9th. They would be separate groups.
9	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: This is Brenda.
10	We're mixing our CAC recommendations with what the FCC
11	is recommending. We've had sort of mental telepathy
12	between the two groups where the FCC thought that
13	there should be a summit.
14	We also believed the TRS working group
15	felt very strongly that we should have a summit to
16	discuss these issues as they relate to homeland
17	security. And the CAC working group, TRS working
18	group, has asked for a separate pre-summit for hearing
19	disability stakeholders.
20	And we would suggest that a separate one
21	for other disabilities be held because there are two

really separate and distinct issues between deaf and

hard of hearing and mobility when it comes to emergency preparedness for situations.

MEMBER ZIEGLER: This is Dixie again. For the meeting on the 9th, there might be several different groups meeting on different topics? There might be a deaf and hard of hearing group that meets and so on, so forth?

understanding that's the way the FCC would like it to be, but this afternoon in our recommendations, we are going to recommend what the working group discussed, that we have two separate forums, one for hearing disabilities and then a separate one for blind, mobility, cognitive disabilities, so that we're not mixing the two together because the issues are so different.

I think we have a lot of issues that we have to discuss. And I think putting them both together is not going to accomplish it. That's why we, the working group, had suggested that there be two separate pre-summits, where experts from each of those two pre-summits would then go to the full summit,

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

which would take place on the 25th. And then we would 2 have a CAC. 3 We are going to make our recommendations this afternoon to the CAC. And the CAC will take 4 5 action, modify, or whatever. 6 MEMBER ZIEGLER: It is possible that the 7 CAC approves our recommendation, the FCC takes that and says, "Well, January 9th is an opportunity for you 8 9 to fulfill your recommendation. We will have a 10 separate group, a separate room for you. Stakeholders 11 that are involved in hearing disabilities, this is 12 where you go, and so on and so forth." So it could 13 end up being combined. 14 CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Yes, yes. 15 MEMBER ZIEGLER: Okay. CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Anything is 16 17 possible because those are just recommendations. 18 We're not policy-makers in this CAC group. just here to get feedback from the various peoples, 19 the constituencies, and we make the recommendations. 20 2.1 MEMBER ZIEGLER: We would probably be okay 22 if that happened, right? I mean, if the FCC says, "Go

1	ahead. Yes, January 9th is your date. This is your
2	group. This is your group," we would be okay with
3	that; is that right, or do we need to decide that as
4	a group today or not and just see what happens?
5	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: We can discuss it
6	certainly. I mean, this is a working group, and we
7	should be discussing it. Does anyone have any
8	opinions? Do you have any concerns about having one
9	pre-summit meeting where all disability groups are
10	represented, with the understanding that maybe we have
11	a breakout place for people who represent hard of
12	hearing, deaf, late deafened, and so forth? Any
13	problems with that? Becky, do you have an opinion?
14	MS. LADEW (via interpreter): I agree with
15	you. One group meeting for all disabilities, yes, and
16	then we all break out.
17	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: The rest of the
18	working group, your opinions? Claude?
19	MEMBER STOUT: This is Claude speaking
20	again. I do support the idea of a January 9th meeting
21	where we have representatives from the different
22	disabilities included in the different working groups.

And then each working group can focus on the various 1 2 disability-related issues. 3 And then, for example, those of us who are deaf and hard of hearing would be discussing amongst 4 5 ourselves the issues that apply to us. And then we 6 can all agree on the various important suggestions or 7 recommendations or solutions. And then when we meet on March 25th, we 8 9 can go ahead and move forward with those recommendations; whereas, if we didn't have the 10 11 January 9th meeting, we wouldn't have our act all that 12 well together. It would just be March 25th, and that 13 really wouldn't quite be enough. 14 CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Amy is going to go find Scott and ask for some clarification on how 15 they envision the January 9th pre-summit happening. 16 17 Moving right along, Dixie, I'm sorry you don't have the homeland security communication issues. 18 MEMBER ZIEGLER: I do, actually. 19 20 sent it to me yesterday. 2.1 CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Great. While we have you on line, is there anything that you want to 22

add to the first section, the communication mode, 1 2 television, that you feel that is omitted, a solution? 3 MEMBER ZIEGLER: I am going to look to others on this particular topic. This is certainly 4 5 outside of my area of expertise. It looks very 6 thorough, but I would look to others to indicate 7 whether or not it is missing anything or to pick out the things that we would need to discuss. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Becky? On the geographic, what about 10 MS. LADEW: 11 the urban population? It talks about the large cities 12 and not the urban. 13 CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Where does it say 14 about large cities, Becky? As I read it, it's not 15 speaking. I understand. It talks about, raises an 16 issue where emergencies may occur in one city, but it 17 doesn't necessarily mean a large city. It could be 18 Podunk, Iowa. Right? And it could be that small city and not happening in -- okay. Got it. We'll ask for 19 20 clarification on that. Got it. Good. 2.1 MS. STEWART: This is Pam. 22 I would just like to point out two things,

that in the majority of emergency situations, -- and I would hope that this would be addressed much more specifically -- a lot of the critical information is given by television, radio reporters from remote locations.

And the radio stations have said or the TV stations often say that they cannot do it immediately the next hourly or the next evening news or whatever. They then add the captions. But if they're telling you where to go, what to do, two hours later at the 5:00 o'clock news is stupid.

I know it says that there is an interpretation on what is critical information, but I know like recently when the governor of Maryland was talking and telling you what to do and what is allowed, to me that is critical information. And it was not captioned.

So if we could then have the FCC address live remote specifically?

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: This is Brenda. What happened recently in Maryland with the emergency situation with the hurricane, yes, it's true that the

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

governor was speaking on television without captions, opened or closed, under what he said. And then what happened, right after that, they had a summary with bullet points of what the TV station believed to be important out of his comments.

Now, that is an interpretation. That is incumbent upon the TV station to pull out what they feel is important information to be given to the public, not necessarily what we feel is important.

I guess it's sort of like, who are they to screen and filter out information for us, the deaf and hard of hearing community? We don't like that.

That's being taken care of. And I don't like that.

I want them to give me the full information verbatim on the screen.

The other thing is that I spent days at the emergency operations center to be the interpreter on TV for any time that this occurred because they were not able to put the captioning on the television.

On to another point, TV currently is required to have the captioning tip built in if the TV is 13 inches or larger. Now, more and more things are

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

becoming smaller and smaller and smaller and portable.

Don't you think that maybe laws should be changed to include televisions that are smaller than 13 inches?

And the other thing, I just arrived from Hawaii last week. I'm on the plane, and they have these little tiny TVs, where I can get a movie. But if someone was with me who was deaf, they would not have captions on that movie because they've skirted it because of the law. The law doesn't require them to have captions on anything lesser than 13 inches.

MEMBER STOUT: I would like to add to what Brenda just said. It's not just portability as an issue. It's our ability to respond differently to disasters like if it was a -- I'm not an expert on the variety of all of this, but I know that we have to respond differently or respond differently to nuclear disasters or chemical disasters or with biological disasters.

I forgot which situation is which, but you can't use electricity. You have to turn off electricity for one of them. So that means you cannot watch your big TVs. So we would have to depend on

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

1	small TVs that are battery-operated in that situation.
2	And that battery-operated TV would tell us if the
3	storm is here or not to go out or whatever. And maybe
4	this could ruin us, but what if we stayed in our homes
5	because they said "Do not come out."
6	So we need the battery-operated TVs to
7	have captioning so we would get the message to stay in
8	and not go out. We need to have that. With the
9	various technologies, we need to have that duplicated.
10	Right now the FCC needs to go to Congress
11	to change the law. Well, we can do that, but Congress
12	already has other issues that they're dwelling on. We
13	can't make that happen immediately. So I would like
14	the FCC to see if they can use within their ancillary
15	judiciousness and authority to make that change.
16	The groups are saying, "Well, 13 inches
17	and up is the only thing that is the law." And so we
18	need to figure out how to resolve this without blame.
19	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Scott's here.
20	And he wants to I think make some clarification on the
l	II

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

summit and the pre-summit and the so forth and so on.

MR. MARSHALL: Sorry I wasn't with you

21

here all the time. I have been floating from group to 1 2 group and all that kind of good stuff. And I'm really 3 glad that you're really taking off with this stuff. The summit mandate involves two 4 5 components. It does relate to issues that are of concern to people who are deaf or hard of hearing but 6 7 also other disability-related issues and communication barriers during times of disaster or terrorist attack 8 9 as well. 10 If this group is not able to take up the 11 other broader disability issues, say at the January 12 9th pre-summit, then I guess we need to convene 13 another group of people to look at that piece of it. 14 I guess what I wanted to clarify is that 15 both components need to be addressed by the summit, 16 both deafness and hard of hearing issues as well as 17 other disability-related issues. 18 Does that help? No? Yes? MEMBER ZIEGLER: Scott, this is Dixie. 19 20 If our group wants to just simply focus on 2.1 the deaf and hard of hearing, we could do that on 22

January 9th? You would get us a room, and we could

1	have a meeting to discuss that? And you all would
2	look elsewhere to have another group potentially meet
3	on all of the other issues? Is that what I hear you
4	saying?
5	MR. MARSHALL: We could do that or we
6	could do this as a full group together. We would be
7	looking to you for this January 9th summit meeting to
8	guide us on who to invite, for example, what
9	organizations in the community should be involved,
10	that kind of thing.
11	MEMBER ZIEGLER: This is Dixie again.
12	We were talking earlier. Brenda, I don't
13	know if we are just going to save our CAC, what we
14	came up with our recommendation this afternoon, or how
15	you want to handle that?
16	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Yes. This is
17	Brenda.
18	We were asked to not divulge our whole
19	presentation this afternoon to the full CAC until the
20	information is presented to the full CAC.
21	Patty?
22	MS. BANNIER: This is Patty Bannier.

I just have a question about the meeting on the 9th. It's a four-hour block of time. And from this meeting, they're going to have interest in all of the various disability groups. They're going to make recommendations to the larger summit on the 25th. Is that correct?

MR. MARSHALL: That's my understanding of what you all had requested back in October, that the disability community could sort of marshal, no pun intended, its forces before sending a representative to the larger summit of all stakeholders on March 25th. If that's not correct, please correct me.

MS. BANNIER: So it could be one large group or it could be the one large group meets and then decides to go into two subcategories, hearing issues and then the other disability issues, and then possibly reconvene so that we're all on the same page before the 25th?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes. Right now we have a four-hour meeting scheduled for the 9th. I suppose we could expand that time if we had to. The thought was that hopefully a lot of the work could be done before

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

that meeting on the 9th and that the time could be

most efficiently spent with a very structured kind of

meeting that would really bring people to closure on

the issues and prepare them for the real discussion

and everything at the broader summit.

MEMBER ZIEGLER: Brenda, this is Dixie.

Do we have the expertise on our committee

to take the lead on this meeting and to cover all

disabilities or what are your thoughts on that?

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: This is Brenda.

I think speaking for myself, I would say no. I don't have the expertise to address issues of the other disability groups. And I feel like I have some expertise to address issues as it relates to the deaf and hard of hearing but insufficient. And that's why we want to have this January 9th pre-summit meeting where we can bring in other representatives that are the expert, subject matter experts, to get their feedback and their opinions and so forth.

MEMBER STOUT: This is Dixie again.

I agree with you, Brenda. I don't even know if we would have the resources as this committee

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

to come up with a list of people to invite for other disabilities. I mean, obviously we can certainly do that for the deaf and hard of hearing part of this agenda, but for us to come up with a list of who to invite and to manage and take on this whole January 9th meeting, I am not sure if our committee has the expertise to do that to cover all disability issues.

Certainly we can if we break out and we split into groups and we have a deaf and hard of hearing group and another group that metes. Certainly I think our committee can play some role in that deaf and hard of hearing group.

But I guess I am brainstorming. I am throwing out ideas. How do you all think about that?

MEMBER STOUT: This is Claude.

I was thinking that that TRS working group can go ahead and suggest good recommendations of people for the January 9th meeting. Our working group can focus on the deaf and hard of hearing issue.

But as for these other disability groups,

I would suggest that the FCC works closely with the

American Association of People With Disabilities, AAPD

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

1	is the acronym, Ferratta and his staff. Also check
2	with the American Council for the Blind and the
3	National Federation of the Blind and Paul Schroeder.
4	And those individuals will be able to give you the
5	ideas of their representative experts for their
6	issues.
7	MS. GREGORY: Hi. This is Pam Gregory.
8	I am with the FCC.
9	I just wanted to not endorse anything, but
10	I am just letting you know that the Department of
11	Labor, the Office of Disability Employment Policy is
12	having an emergency disability summit the 4th and 5th
13	of December here in Washington. I can go up to my
14	office and print out information on it. But it's
15	free. And I think that there is still room for that
16	summit.
17	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Good information.
18	MEMBER STOUT: This is Claude.
19	I think we need some clarification. That
20	summit on the 4th and 5th is for federal managers to
21	be aware about how to meet the needs of people with

disabilities by responding to their needs, like

1	responding to federal employees, those who have
2	disabilities who work for the federal government.
3	That is on their focus. But it's great if you want to
4	get ideas, but that program has a narrower focus than
5	what we are.
6	MS. GREGORY: This is Pam Gregory.
7	Claude is correct, but my understanding
8	after talking with the planners of the summit is that
9	they are looking for outside expertise, policy-makers,
10	not necessarily state or local or federal government
11	employees.
12	And it might be something that you might
13	learn something from. I know I am going to go because
14	I know I can learn a lot.
15	MEMBER STOUT: Yes. That's good.
16	MS. STEWART: This is Pam Stewart.
17	I just want to summarize what I think I am
18	hearing here because this is what I am feeling, that,
19	first of all, I don't think four hours for the
20	pre-meeting would do it.
21	But what I would like to see and I think

what we have been talking about is maybe present to

the entire CAC because they do have the correct context. They work with different disabilities.

That's why they are on the CAC. And there are a lot of people there who have contacts in the disability group.

Between all of us, I am sure we can find people and put out a call to have subcommittee meetings in each group, whether it be a group for people with mobility disabilities, hard of hearing and deaf because hard of hearing is different than deaf, and each one make bullets and make points and have one person that will then present and then get together in the afternoon and bring all of them up together to have an overall beginning point of what we feel.

This committee could be like the lead on it and sort of coordinate it all and not have to have the expertise all in one place if we just sort of do the work of pulling everybody's words together and making it coherent when everybody gets together.

MEMBER ZIEGLER: This is Dixie.

Pam, I agree that the CAC has -- I mean, maybe there is another working group that can help us

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

1	with this. I think that's a great idea.
2	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Okay. Becky?
3	MS. LADEW: Can we get back to what Pam
4	said? I could be the representative of two.
5	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Two groups?
6	MS. LADEW: The mobility-impaired and the
7	STS, speech to speech.
8	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Yes, you could.
9	Okay.
10	Anybody else?
11	(No response.)
12	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: I think this
13	document that the FCC gave us Becky?
14	MS. LADEW: Ask Scott about the urban
15	issue.
16	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Good. Okay.
17	Scott, on the second page of this FCC document about
18	homeland security, it speaks about geographic location
19	in the first bullet. And I'll read it. It says,
20	"Raises an issue where emergencies may occur in one
21	city but have a more broader interest could have a
22	greater impact."

When you speak of city, are you speaking of like Baltimore City, a huge city, or are you just speaking of a location, a town? Could it apply to a rural sense as well? MR. MARSHALL: I would defer to Pam Gregory or Tracy Randolph on that question since I did not write this document. Pam, can you address that? CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Pam? MS. GREGORY: Hi. This is Pam Gregory. No, I can't. And I can tell you why. reason, I can tell you what Pam Gregory thinks, but I cannot represent the commission. And if the committee has any questions on any rules or if they feel like the rules are not clear or vague, I think that you should officially ask for clarification. And also if

My, Pam Gregory's, impression is that is a geographic location, has nothing to do with the number of people. But I have been wrong in the past, and I could be wrong in the future. I just wouldn't

you think they're not clear, ask that they be clear,

that something be done or that more consumer fact

sheets are made in a consumer-friendly tone.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

want that responsibility on my shoulders.

2.1

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Right. See, I'm envisioning a situation, a chemical spill that happens in Aberdeen, Maryland which might impact another city called Belair, Maryland because of the nature of the chemical spill. That's where I envision it, but I'm not sure. And it was a good point that was raised.

Claude?

MEMBER STOUT: I just want to follow up on Becky's thinking in terms of geographic location. Is she asking basically where it says "city," whether that phrase be changed to "city or town or geographic location"?

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Okay. In this sentence in the geographic location section of it, it says, "Raises an issue where emergencies may occur in one city but may have a broader interest, could have a greater impact."

Becky wants to know. Does this literally mean city, like big city, or can it mean Rockville?

Something happens in Rockville, but it could influence or impact Derwood. Derwood is a small town, well,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	from my memory a long time ago. So are they talking
2	about Rockville, only a big, big, big city, and that's
3	it? Derwood would not be included in this because
4	it's a rural area?
5	MS. BANNIER: This is Patty.
6	Are you asking or suggesting that perhaps
7	instead of using the word "city," use the word
8	"location"?
9	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Exactly.
10	MS. BANNIER: Would that solve that
11	problem so it's anywhere if it's unincorporated or
12	well-established?
13	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Right. Dixie,
14	are you with us? Do you have any comments?
15	MEMBER ZIEGLER: I agree. I think that
16	will make sense. I am right with you.
17	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Okay.
18	MS. LADEW: I have another question about
19	closed caption. Last night I turned on the TV. What
20	happens if the person was not watching TV? How would
21	you be alerted?
22	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Well, this

1	addresses some other ways, but it talks about the
2	radio and, of course, for deaf people, that's not an
3	option.
4	MS. LADEW: What about a flashing light
5	system, like there is in the fire alarm?
6	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: I believe on page
7	4, the NOAA weather radio and where it has visual and
8	vibrating alarms with simple text readouts and
9	alerting systems where they have a statement, a watch,
10	and a warning on it.
1	I'm not familiar with that device, but I
12	will become familiar with it between now and then.
13	MS. LADEW: Actually, that's important
L4	because not everybody is watching TV.
15	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Exactly. Okay.
16	I would like to kind of skip ahead because time is
L7	like running out and we've got a half an hour. I
18	would like to get some ideas of who, first not
L9	specific people, first general types of organizations
20	or subject matter experts that should be included in
21	our January 9th pre-summit to make sure. And then we
22	can match names if you have suggestions for names of

1	experts for that meeting.
2	Does anybody want to start? For the
3	January 9th meeting. Patty?
4	MS. BANNIER: The American Association of
5	Deaf-Blind.
6	MEMBER ZIEGLER: This is Dixie.
7	Toni Dunn. And I don't know what
8	organization she represents. Otherwise, I wouldn't
9	have given her name. But she is very much aware of
10	9/11 issues and relay.
11	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: She works for
12	Positron Company. Yes, she's a subject matter expert
13	for 9/11 and PSAPs.
14	MS. STEWART: This is Pam Stewart.
15	In addition to all of the organizations
16	like SHHH and TDI, I think one of the things that we
17	miss often, I think we ought to have somebody from
18	like the CODA organization or somebody that is a CODA.
19	Again I'll use Brenda as the example. She
20	has worked so much with 9/11 in our state because she
21	has that growing up with that, making sure that her
22	deaf parents. And she sees both sides of it. So I

think that their view is very important to put into 1 2 this, too. 3 CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Becky, did you 4 want to say something? 5 MS. LADEW: UCP. 6 CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Claude? 7 MEMBER STOUT: I think it would also be good to include representatives from consumer 8 electronics associations and ask one or two TRS 9 10 vendors, paging companies, ask people who run the 11 emergency e-mail services. Have you ever heard of 12 e-emergency? 13 We need to more involved from industry and 14 more from trade associations because they are really the front line of contact. So to be able to tell them 15 what we need and the experience, we ask them, "Can you 16 17 get something together as soon as possible to serve a 18 given need?" And then we need to find out what their technical imitations are. 19 20 They may be able to say, "Oh, yeah, we've 21 got technology, but we don't have the money." So we 22 get some information from that. So the FCC can share

1	that information as well.
2	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Good point.
3	Would those people be involved in our first meeting,
4	the January 9th, or the subsequent meeting on March
5	25th?
6	MEMBER STOUT: Well, if on January 9th, it
7	might be good because then we would know what the
8	technological limitations are or capabilities are. On
9	the 25th, we have already spent a lot of time with our
10	various ideas. So we need to get on paper what is
11	possible and what is not.
12	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: TTY
13	manufacturers?
14	MEMBER STOUT: Yes, another good
15	suggestion. Like CAPTEL perhaps? CAPTEL is a
16	different group, but we need to be sensitive. We use
17	them because there are people who use CAPTEL and don't
18	use TTY. We have people who have stopped using TTY
19	and depend completely on pagers. So if something
20	happens while they are on the road, they need to get
21	their information through a text pager.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Are you also

1	including people from CTIA, cellular telephone
2	industry, because deaf people, hard of hearing people
3	use cell phones in emergencies?
4	MEMBER STOUT: Sure, right.
5	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Pagers, T-mobile,
6	things like that.
7	MEMBER STOUT: Yes.
8	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Okay. Pam?
9	Becky, you're fired.
10	MS. STEWART: I think that this is a
11	really, really important issue. I think that we ought
12	to look to see about having another subgroup of people
13	that are technical that will be in the meeting with
14	people like from the pager companies and with the cell
15	companies to bring up the issue of people with
16	disabilities to sort of find out what really are the
17	advantages and the limitations.
18	We all know about the delays in pagers and
19	what are the ramifications of using them in an
20	emergency if the towers are full, all that kind of
21	stuff.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

But I think that's a whole group in

itself. So if we could have a couple of people who are users and understand it technically to be in that working group with the people that provide those kinds of technologies, I think that would be extremely beneficial to everybody.

MEMBER STOUT: Claude speaking.

I don't mean to overwhelm you with all of the different possible representatives, but for the January 9th meeting, we need to be careful.

I'm not saying we need to limit the representatives, but I don't want to go overboard with participants as well so that it just becomes a glut of information so that we can't mete our objectives for that one-day meeting. I think we should perhaps limit it to 15 to 20 people and then be able to achieve some results.

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: That's my concern right now, too. I'm thinking of a four-hour meeting to discuss the various issues related to deaf and hard of hearing for health, public safety, telephone communication, relay communication, whether it be through internet protocol relay, VRS, TRS, CAPTEL, TV

2.1

captioning. I think it's a humongous task.

2.1

And my thinking is to get consumers' involvement, feedback, and then possibly inviting those industry members to the March 25th, where we spell out here are our problems. Give me solutions for that and then start them thinking and then bring it to the full CAC on March 26th. I mean, I don't know. I am just throwing it out as an idea. Claude?

MEMBER STOUT: Well, I think at this
point, we can't solve the problem by noon. I am just
suggesting that the TRS working group have a committee
to help the FCC to plan for the January 9th meeting as
well as the March 25th meeting. And that committee
can look back on what we have suggested this morning
and our ideas and concerns. That way I think we can
move on with that.

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Okay. I think that's a wonderful idea. Why don't we just take a quick break? And then we'll come back in about ten minutes and start thinking about how we want to set this up. How about a small group who is going to work with the FCC on this issue in planning? Thank you,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	everyone.
2	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
3	the record at 11:35 a.m. and went back on
4	the record at 11:55 a.m.)
5	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Read through this
6	document from the FCC so we can be prepared to add
7	some other ideas and concerns.
8	MEMBER STOUT: Also, I suggest that this
9	afternoon you make a special announcement publicly
10	praising the FCC for their work on this document. I'm
11	elated. It is very responsive to us as consumers. So
12	that's very good.
13	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: And this is only
14	a swatch. It's just started. I mean, it's just
15	basic.
16	MEMBER STOUT: Yes. I thought a word is
17	rapine document.
18	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Okay.
19	MEMBER ZIEGLER: Brenda, this is Dixie.
20	So what homework do you see that we have
21	between now and the 9th? Could you recap that for us?
22	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: What homework do

you foresee us needing to do between now and the 9th? Well, actually, we're talking about the first week of February having a pre-summit.

Homework is to review. We will have a telephone conference call between now and then, probably a few of them, to meet and discuss this document from the FCC, the draft document, and add some more ideas and keep trying to develop a list of not individuals at this point but groups, constituency groups that need to be represented, and subject matter experts who need to be able to participate in this pre-summit meeting the first week of February.

MEMBER ZIEGLER: This is Dixie again.

So January 9th is something different than what is going to happen the first week of February?

I missed that. I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Well, we're going to suggest that it not happen January 9th just because we don't feel that there is sufficient time to plan this appropriately and prepare.

MEMBER ZIEGLER: I agree. I am glad to hear that you are thinking about pushing it back.

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

1	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Yes. I feel like
2	we have got so much time and holidays. You've got
3	Jewish holidays. You've got Christmas, New Year's,
4	and then people taking vacation time during that time.
5	I just think it's too rushed. I think we,
6	the working committee, all kind of agreed that we feel
7	like it needs to be put off a little bit.
8	MEMBER ZIEGLER: Wonderful. Very good.
9	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Okay. Anything
10	else because I see the FCC has lunch for us? And the
1	other working groups are coming back into the room.
L2	So it's becoming more and more noisy.
13	(No response.)
L 4	CHAIRPERSON KELLY-FREY: Dixie, thank you.
15	(Whereupon, at 11:59 a.m., the foregoing
16	matter was adjourned.)
L7	
18	
L 9	
20	
21	